

Monographic Journals of the Near East

General Editor: Giorgio Buccellati

Afroasiatic Linguistics

Editors:

Robert Hetzron, Santa Barbara

Russell G. Schuh, Los Angeles

Advisory Board:

Ariel Bloch, Berkeley

Talmy Givón, Los Angeles

Thomas G. Penchoen, Los Angeles

Stanislav Segert, Los Angeles

Volume 6

Issue 4

May 1979

Bibliographic Bulletin



Undena Publications

Malibu 1979

AFROASIATIC LINGUISTICS

AAL includes contributions in linguistics within the vast domain of Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) languages. Articles of general, theoretical interest using Afroasiatic material, descriptive, historical and comparative studies are included.

Editors:

Robert Hetzron (698 Zink Av., Santa Barbara, Ca. 93111, U.S.A.)

Russell G. Schuh (15337 Hart St., Van Nuys, Ca. 91406, U.S.A.)

Send all manuscripts to Robert Hetzron or (for Chadic) to Russell G. Schuh. Consult stylesheet on back cover for editing format.

MONOGRAPHIC JOURNALS OF THE NEAR EAST

MJNE is a system of journals on the Near East, with each journal devoted to a specialized study area, and each issue consisting normally of a single article. Current journals in the system are *Afroasiatic Linguistics*, *Assur*, *Computer a Afroasiatic Linguistics*, *Assur*, *Computer Aided Research in Ancient Near Eastern Studies* and *Syro-Mesopotamian Studies*.

General Subscription. - For a prepayment of \$17.00 the subscriber selects random issues from within the entire system as desired, up to a total of 200 pages. (A plate counts as two pages.) The subscriber is also entitled to (1) periodical lists of abstracts from all journals in the system, and (2) reservation to any journal within the system whereby issues of a given journal are sent on approval immediately upon publication (and may be returned within two weeks).

Library Subscription. - A prepayment of \$17.00 for each journal in the system secures all issues of a single volume as soon as they are published. This subscription schedule does not allow the selection of random issues.

Library subscriptions are available to both institutions and individual scholars.

Individual issues are numbered *sequentially* within each volume. Each issue has its own pagination. A volume is closed when a total of about 200 pages is reached.

A *title page* and a *table of contents* listing all issues within each volume are sent to all subscribers at the close of a volume.

Periodicity in the order of appearance of issues is not predetermined. A volume, however, is generally completed within one year.

Back volumes are available for \$20.00 per volume. Payment must accompany orders from individuals. A handling fee of \$1.00 will be charged to libraries if order is not prepaid.

Order from: UNDENA PUBLICATIONS, P.O. Box 97, Malibu, California 90265, U.S.A.

ISBN: 0-89003-001-4

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photo-copy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC BULLETIN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
I. REVIEWS	1
Richard C. Steiner, <i>The Case for Fricative Laterals in Proto-Semitic</i> (American Oriental Series, 59). New Haven, 1977. By Werner Diem . . .	1
Joshua Blau, <i>An Adverbial Construction in Hebrew and Arabic: Sentence Adverbials in Frontal Position Separated from the Rest of the Sentence</i> (Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, VI:1). Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1977. By Richard C. Steiner	5
II. BIBLIOGRAPHY	11
Afroasiatica in general linguistic publications (since 1970-)	11

I. REVIEWS

- R. C. Steiner, *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic* (American Oriental Series, 59). New Haven, 1977, 202 S.
By WERNER DIEM (Universität zu Köln)

Die Natur der konventionell *ḏ* und *ṣ* umschriebenen semitischen Laute ist eines der interessantesten und gleichzeitig schwierigsten Probleme der Semitistik. In dem zur Rezension vorliegenden Buch—der revidierten Fassung einer 1973 an der Universität von Pennsylvania eingereichten Dissertation—geht Verf. dem Fragenkomplex nach, und dies so ausführlich und genau, daß man die Abhandlung wohl als die umfangreichste Untersuchung bezeichnen kann, die jemals einem doch so verhältnismäßig kleinen Ausschnitt

des Semitischen gewidmet worden ist. Damit soll freilich nicht gesagt sein, daß Verf. eine zu breite Art der Darstellung gewählt hat: im Gegenteil ist die Untersuchung durchaus konzis, im Einzelnen manchmal fast etwas zu knapp. Bei der Durchführung der Untersuchung zeigt sich Verf. als guter Kenner des neusüdarabischen und nordwestsemitischen Bereichs, versteht aber auch das Akkadische und Arabische kompetent zu behandeln, wenn auch vielleicht insgesamt gesehen der arabische Bereich, soweit es sich um klassisch-arabische Philologie handelt, nicht ganz so souverän und detailliert berücksichtigt ist, wie es wünschenswert gewesen wäre. Zum semitischen Material zieht Verf. zahlreiche Parallelen aus anderen Sprachen heran, die das Wesen lateraler Laute zu verdeutlichen geeignet sind. Dieses Verfahren kann zweifellos manchmal Gewinn bringen, andererseits birgt es insofern eine gewisse Gefahr in sich, als damit möglicherweise Aspekte in das Semitische hineingetragen werden, die ihm fremd sind. So hat Rez. etwa den Eindruck, daß die Heranziehung einer Erscheinung des Nootka, einer Indianersprache, für das Problem von aram. q_2 ($< d$) keine Hilfe bedeutet und im Gegenteil der Analyse des Problems durch Verf. eher geschadet hat. Von solchen Einzelfällen abgesehen hat aber Verf. das spröde Material behutsam interpretiert und sich vor vorschnellen Schlüssen gehütet. Deshalb ist das Buch in jenen Punkten, in denen man Verf. nicht zu folgen bereit ist, immer noch eine gute Diskussionsgrundlage.

Es kann nicht Aufgabe dieser Besprechung sein, die Gedankengänge von Verf. im einzelnen nachzuzeichnen—bei der Fülle des Materials wäre dies ein langwieriges Unterfangen. Es soll vielmehr zunächst der Inhalt des Buches in großen Zügen dargestellt werden, woran sich Einzelbemerkungen anschließen sollen.

Nach einer Darstellung der Problemgeschichte der lateralen Frikative (Introduction), in der man übrigens eine Erwähnung der von Verf. abgelehnten Hypothesen W. Fischers (S. 105f.) vermißt, behandelt Verf. zunächst nach der Definition der Laterale (Kap. I) die lateralen Frikative in den neusüdarabischen Sprachen (Kap. II), wo er angesichts der zahlreichen von europäischen Reisenden stammenden Hinweise erhebliche Interpretationsschwierigkeiten zu bewältigen hat. Es ist schade, daß Verf. das 1977 erschienene Harsūsī-Lexikon von T. M. Johnstone nicht mehr heranziehen konnte. Daran anschließend (Kap. III) gibt Verf. eine willkommene Zusammenstellung von Wortgleichungen mit den Lateralen q und $ṣ$ zwischen den neusüdarabischen und den anderen semitischen Sprachen. Kap. IV ist der Beschreibung von q bei den arabischen Grammatikern gewidmet, dann werden in Kap. V bis Kap. VIII die Reflexe von arab. q in Lehnwörtern aus dem Arabischen untersucht, worauf Kap. IX der bekannten assyrischen Schreibung *Ruldayu* gewidmet ist. Damit ist der Komplex des Lautes q zunächst abgeschlossen, und Verf. wendet sich nun dem Problem des lateralen $ṣ$ im Arabischen (Kap. X und Kap. XI) zu. Die restlichen Kapitel (Kap. XII bis Kap. XX) sind der Frage von $ṣ$ ($< ṣ$) — q — Doubletten im Arabischen (Kap. XII), der Frage der Inkompatibilität von $ṣ$ ($< ṣ$) und q im Arabischen (Kap. XIII), weiteren Doubletten mit $ṣ$ und q (Kap. XIV und Kap. XV) und anderen verwandten Problemen gewidmet.

Insgesamt gesehen kommt Verf. zum Schluß, daß das Semitische einen stimmlosen lateralen Frikativ $ṣ$ und ein emphatisches oder glottalisiertes stimmloses Gegenstück q kannte. Man wird diese Theorie, auch wenn man Verf. nicht immer folgt, akzeptieren können, und zwar schon deshalb, weil sie den in den Einzelsprachen vorliegenden Fakten am ehesten gerecht wird. Dennoch bleiben Fragen, die noch behandelt werden müßten. Dazu gehört die arabische Schreibung von q mit dem Zeichen von aram. $ṣ$ (der Punkt im $qāḍ$ wurde erst später hinzugefügt); bedeutsam ist Verf.s Nachweis (S. 149ff.), daß der von J. Blau als Ursache angeführte aramäische Reflex $ṣ$ (statt $ʿ$) von q (wodurch sich eine Lautgleichung aram. $ṣ$ — arab. q ergeben hätte) lautlich konditioniert ist. Der zweite Punkt betrifft die Frage, warum sich $ṣ$ und q , wenn sie denn ein Paar bildeten, jeweils so verschieden entwickelten, und schließlich hätte man sich gewünscht, daß der Laut $ṣ$ (= arab. $ṣ$) einbezogen worden wäre, zumindest was die Entwicklung im Arabischen betrifft. Aber Verf. ist sich durchaus bewußt, daß die Diskussion noch nicht abgeschlossen ist (S. 155).

Es folgen einzelne Bemerkungen zu Punkten, die Rez. bei der Lektüre aufgefallen sind.
Verf. möge sie als Zeichen

S.12 Daß die neusüdarabischen Sprachen Tochtersprachen des Altsüdarabischen seien, müßte Verf. erst noch nachweisen. Rez. teilt diese Meinung nicht. — Die Entwicklung der arabischen Sibilanten formuliert man besser als 1. $\dot{\text{š}} > \text{š}$, 2. $\dot{\text{š}} > \dot{\text{z}}$. Bei einem Ansatz als " $\dot{\text{š}} > \dot{\text{z}} > \text{š}$ " müßte auch altes $\dot{\text{z}}$ als š erscheinen.

S.16 Zu Landbergs Angaben ist zu bemerken, daß das Bairische kein velarisierendes ℓ kennt.

S.26,13 ʿāšru : 1. besser ʿašru .

S.27,-5 sahdā : 1. sāhdā .

S.29ff. Warum erscheint nun für das Aramäische eine Spalte "Targumic Aramaic" und nicht mehr "Old Aramaic" und "Syriac"?

S.38,-20 "former" und "latter" sind offenbar vertauscht. — Die Ausführungen der folgenden Seiten zu aram. q_2 scheinen mir zu den schwächeren Teilen des Buches zu gehören. Einerseits soll aram. $q_2 = q^p$, ein glottalisierter (emphatischer) uvularer Verschlußlaut sein (S.39, 40), andererseits ein postdorsaler Laut (S.39 unten). Des weiteren ist m.E. nicht einzusehen, warum der Wandel $q_2 > g$ in ghk "lachen" "a dissimilatory loss of the emphatic feature" sein soll, wenn dafür jede Ursache fehlt, nämlich eine zweite Emphatica im Wort. ($z^c h < \dot{\text{z}}^c h$ und $z^c q < \dot{\text{z}}^c q$ sind keine Parallelen, da z durch Kontaktassimilation an ʿ entstanden ist, wie etwa auch in syr.-arab. $zġr$, verglichen mit kairen. ṣuġayya .) Davon abgesehen ist jedenfalls das arabische uvulare q NICHT emphatisch, wie sich am einfachsten an den danach stehenden Allophonen der Vokale (andere als bei den Emphatica) zeigen läßt. Die Ausführungen sind auch insofern etwas hypothetisch, als ohne weitere Begründung vorausgesetzt wird, daß das Aramäische (noch) glottalisierte Laute und nicht Emphatica kannte. Und warum sollte das vorausgesetzte q^p unbedingt zu ʿ werden? Eher wäre p zu erwarten.

S.41 unten Zur Frage von hebr. $\dot{\text{z}}$ vgl. W. Diem, "Das Problem von $\dot{\text{z}}$ im Althebräischen und die kanaänäische Lautverschiebung". In: ZDMG 124 (1974), S.221-252.

S.42ff. Rez. fragt sich, ob es notwendig war, aus einer Arbeit E. Kutschers ausführliche Zitate gegen G. Garbini anzuführen, wenn sich dann doch herausstellt (S.45 unten), daß "Kutscher's response to Garbini is flawed by his failure to see what is bothering Garbini".

S.53,3 Das $-a$ in parāsa "he spread" ist nicht unbedingt ursemitisch, sondern vielleicht nur gemeinwestsemitisch.

S.56 Fn. 50 ist doppelt.

S.57 oben Die Behauptung, daß das Arabische "is genealogically close to MSA", müßte erst noch bewiesen werden. Die wissenschaftliche Diskussion geht in eine ganz andere Richtung.

S.60,-15 mīn bayna : 1. mīn baynī

S.60ff. Zu den Artikulationszonen hätten unbedingt die phonetischen Fragmente im *Kitāb al-ʿain* von al-Ḥalīl hinzugezogen werden müssen (S. Wild: *Das Kitāb al-ʿain und die arabische Lexikographie*. Wiesbaden 1965, S.30ff.), die inzwischen auch in einer — leider ganz unzuverlässigen — Edition des *Kitāb al-ʿain* von ʿAbdallāh Darwīš (Bagdad 1967) vorliegen.

S.62,14 ʿilā mitla: 1. ʿilā mitli

S.63,19 Zum Terminus *inhirāf* vgl. Wild: *Kitāb al-ʿain* S.32 Fn. 27.

S.69f. Bei der Erörterung der Lehnwörter im Spanischen, welche gegen die Regel *al-* mit nicht-assimiliertem *l* aufweisen, müßte m.E. zwischen umgangssprachlichen und gelehrten Entlehnungen unterschieden werden. Das Wort *aldebarān* gehört deutlich der zweiten Kategorie an.

S.105 Es überrascht, daß Verf. die von J. Kuryłowicz angeführten Wörter in dem nicht zuständigen Wörterbuch von H. Wehr und in dem zwar zuständigen, aber unvollständigen Lexikon von E. Lane verifizieren wollte. Hier hätte er natürlich auf die einheimischen Wörterbücher (vor allem LA und TA) zurückgreifen müssen.

S.106 Mit dem Begriff "Proto-South Semitic" folgt Verf. der herkömmlichen Einteilung der semitischen Sprachen. Anders R. Hetzron in verschiedenen Arbeiten.

S.115 oben Das Schema erweckt den (falschen) Eindruck, als ob *q₂* und ʿ emphatisch wären.

S.121 unten Der dissimilatorische Vorgang, durch den *š* in hebr. *šḥṭ* aus *ḏ* entstanden sein soll (vgl. auch S.111f.) ist mir unklar. Könnte der Ersatz von *ḏ* durch *š* nicht von Formen, z.B. solchen des Imperfekts ausgegangen sein, in denen *ḏ* sich in Kontaktstellung mit folgendem stimmlosen *h* befand und sich ihm partiell assimilieren konnte?

S.123,10 *bšām*: 1. *bašām*.

S.131 oben Die Diskussion über die Einführung eines Schwa in einer aramäischen Form ʿ*arslā* ist nach Meinung von Rez. überflüssig, da das Schwa aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach sowieso keine sprachliche Realität war. Genauer untersucht werden müßte aber, ob von einer Form ʿ*arslā* (**aršā*) wirklich so ohne weiteres eine Status constructus-Form ʿ*arsal* hätte zurückgebildet werden können. Um Klarheit zu gewinnen, müßten die entsprechenden Bildungen bei den vierradikaligen Nomina statistisch erfaßt werden. Bei den dreiradikaligen Nomina herrscht jedenfalls beim *qaṭlā*-Typ der Status constructus/Status absolutus *qṭel* vor.

S.137,16 Es ist mir unklar, warum Verf. *kaldāyā* statt *kaldāyā* schreibt.

S.147 Fn.10 Die ägyptische Transkription von kan. *ṭ* und *š* mit dem gleichen Phonem bzw. Buchstaben, der Verf. besondere Bedeutung zumißt, ist bereits beachtet worden (Dien: "Das Problem von *ṭ* im Althebräischen" S. 231ff.

Die einschlägige Literatur ist sehr sorgfältig zusammengestellt und weitgehend erfaßt, abgesehen von Stellungnahmen in arabischen Untersuchungen (z.B. M. Hiğāzī: *ʿilm al-luḡa al-ʿarabiyya*. Kuwait 1973, S.299f.) und vereinzelt Abhandlungen zum Thema in arabischen Zeitschriften, die aber kaum neue Gesichtspunkte erbracht hätte. Eine inzwischen erschienene Arbeit F. Corrientes zu *ḏ-l*-Doubletten im klassischen Arabisch (JSS 23, 1978) ist nachzutragen.

Man hat Verf. aufrichtig für seine wertvolle Arbeit zu danken und darf auf eine angekündigte Untersuchung zum Problem der Glottalisierung/Emphase im Semitischen (S.155 unten) gespannt sein.

Joshua Blau, *An Adverbial Construction in Hebrew and Arabic: Sentence Adverbials in Frontal Position Separated from the Rest of the Sentence* (Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, VI 1). Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1977.

By RICHARD C. STEINER (Yeshiva University, New York)

This book deals with sentence adverbials in initial position which are joined to (or, in B's interpretation, separated from) the rest of the sentence by a conjunction and/or presentative. Among the Hebrew adverbial + conjunction/presentative phrases discussed are: Biblical *gam + ki/hinne*, *atta + ki/hinne*, *ax + ki/hinne*; Mishnaic *uvilvad + še*, *po'amim + še*, *mikkan še*; Medieval *kimat + še/asher/wə*, *ulay + še*, *lofi da'aθ X + še*; Modern Literary *bentayim + wə*, *pit'om + wə*, *kayadua + še*, *ax + še*; Modern Colloquial *betax + še*, *bircinut + še*, *madua + še*. Among the Arabic phrases dealt with are: Classical, post-Classical/Middle Standard *li-šālika + mā*, *la'yan + mā*, *la'alla + mā/an*, *haqqan 'anna*; Middle Substandard *išān + fa*, *lišālika + fa*, *bi-haqqin + fa/an(na)*, *bi-l-jumlati + fa(-inna)/an(na)*; Modern Standard *ft l-wāqi'i + 'anna/fa-inna*, *bi-kalimatin uxrā + fa*, *ft l-haqīqati 'anna*; Modern Colloquial *ṭūl il-layl + w*, *kull yūm + w*.

Even this small sample suffices to show the remarkable scope of this book. It traces the development of a syntactic construction through every period of the history of two languages (Hebrew and Arabic), adducing examples from well over a hundred ancient, medieval, and modern primary sources. The examples are accompanied by very learned philological notes in which the views of earlier scholars are discussed and criticized. The level of erudition is quite astonishing. I personally would be happy if I were capable of dealing with even ONE language in this fashion. The sad truth, however, is that I am not, and I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to the one language (Hebrew) and the one period (Biblical) in which I feel sufficiently at home to offer suggestions to one of the leading Semitists of our day.

My first suggestion is that, in a number of instances, the conjunction and/or presentative may be governed not, as B assumes, by the sentence adverbial which precedes it, but rather by a verb which does not appear on the surface. Thus, the expression *baḥalomi wəhinne* 'in my dream and behold' (Gen 40:9,16), dealt with on pp. 21-2, might be analyzed as having the same deep structure as *wa'eere baḥalomi wəhinne* 'and I saw in my dream and behold', an expression which actually occurs in the following chapter (Gen 41:22). The advantage of this solution is that adverbials do not generally govern *wəhinne* in BH, as B. himself notes (p. 21), whereas the verb *ʾr̥y* 'see' always takes either *wəhinne* or *ki* 'that' as a complementizer.

Similarly in Est 5:6

ma ššə'elathex, wəyinnaθen lax
uma bbaqqasathex 'aš ḥaši hammalxuθ, wəθe'aš

'What is your petition, . . . and it shall be granted to you.

And what is your request costing up to half the kingdom, — and it shall be done.'

the *wə* of *wəθe'aš* may be governed by a deep structure imperative like *haggiḏi* (cf. Gen 29:15 *haggiḏa li ma mmaskurtexa* 'Tell me what your wages are' rather than by the adverbial *'aš ḥaši hammalxuθ*, as B. holds (p. 24). This suggestion is based on two observations:

- a) There is no adverbial in Est 5:6 which could explain the *wə* of *wəyinnaθen* (cf. also the *wə* of *wə'e'eše* in Deut 12:30 *'exa ya'avdu haggoyim ha'elle 'eθ 'elohehem*

wəʔeʔeʔe ken gam ʔani 'How do these nations worship their gods and I will also do so').

- b) The sequence *wə* + jussive (like *wə* + cohortative and *wə* + imperative) is almost always governed by a preceding imperative, jussive, or cohortative in BH. An example of imperative + *wə* + cohortative whose theme closely parallels that of Est 5:6 is Ps 2:8 *šəʔal mimmenni wəʔettəna* ... 'Ask of me and I will give/make ...'

On the other hand, I agree with B's tacit assumption (p. 23) that no deep-structure imperative has been deleted in Ju 16:2

ʔəʔ ʔor habboqer waharaynuhu

pace the exegetes (e.g. Septuagint, Isaiah of Trani, Altschuler, and S.R. Driver in BDB and *Tenses*) who have interpreted this sentence to mean 'Let us / We will wait until morning and kill him.' All of these exegetes assumed, no doubt, that BH *ʔəʔ* always means 'until' and hence can modify only atelic verbs. In actual fact, BH *ʔəʔ* can also modify telic (also called "accomplishment", "achievement", "wholistic", or "nonsubinterval") verbs, in which case it means 'by (the time of)' (cf. Rashi on Nu 10:21, II K 16:11, Ez 33:22), and that is clearly the meaning of *ʔəʔ* in our verse, as Yechezkel Kaufmann points out in his commentary. B. renders *ʔəʔ* here as 'in' rather than 'by', but since Israeli Hebrew *ʔad* (like Yiddish *bis*) has the same ambiguity as its BH counterpart, it is likely that B's understanding of the sentence is the same as mine.

Another suggestion which I would like to offer concerns B's assertion (p. 22) that "the use of *waw coniunctivum/consecutivum* separating a sentence adverbial from the rest of the sentence is comparatively frequent, especially after temporal adverbs" It is clear from the qualifier "comparatively" and from the examples which follow that B. is dealing here only with cases in which the sentence adverbial is not preceded by *wayhi/wəhaya* 'and it was/will be'. The extremely (not comparatively) frequent use of these verbs with temporal adverbials followed by *wə* is dealt with in a different section (pp. 7-8), apparently because B. assumes that they have a different structure.

This assumption is also revealed by B's translations on pp. 7-8. For example, Gen 8:6

wayhi miqqeš ʔarbaʔim yom wayyiṣtaḥ noaḥ ʔeθ ḥallon hatteva ...

is rendered 'And it came to pass at the end of forty days that Noah opened the window of the ark' (the adverbial modifies *wayhi*) rather than 'And it came to pass that, at the end of forty days, Noah opened the window of the ark' (the adverbial modifies *wayyiṣtaḥ noaḥ* etc.). The former rendering has the weight of tradition behind it, but I believe that the latter rendering is shown to be correct by the many instances in which an unmodified *wayhi/wəhaya* takes a clause as its subject.

This structure is seen most clearly when *wayhi/wəhaya* is followed by either a non-temporal subordinate clause, e.g. Gen 41:13

wayhi kaʔašer paṯar lanu ken haya
'And it came to pass that as he interpreted to us, so it was.'

(also Nu 15:24, Dt 21:14, Ju 4:20, and many others), or a verbal clause, e.g. Gen 4:14

wəhaya kol moš ʔi yaharveni
'And it shall come to pass that anyone who finds me will kill me.'

(also Ex 18:22, 33:7, Jos 7:15, I K 17:4, II K 8:21, 20:4, Is 22:7), or a nominal clause with a pronominal subject, e.g. Gen 42:35

wayhi hem mōriqim šaqqehem ...

'And it came to pass that they were emptying their sacks ...'

(also II Sam 13:30, I K 12:20, II K 2:11, 8:5, 13:21, 19:37, Jer 37:13). There are even cases where the sentence following *wayhi/wəhaya* has a pronoun for a subject and *hyy* for a verb, e.g.

wəhaya hu yihye lōxa ləfe (Ex 4:16)

'And it shall come to pass that he will be as a mouth to you'

wəhaya hu uθmuraθo yihye qqoðeš (Lev 27:10,33)

'And it shall come to pass that it and its substitute will be holy'

In all of these cases, it is clear that we must translate 'And it came/shall come to pass that S', and I see no reason why this rendering should change simply because S happens to begin with a temporal adverbial.

My third suggestion concerns B's attempt (p. 27) to determine which constituent of *halo* (i.e. *ha* or *lo*) governs *ki* in the phrase *halo ki* (I Sam 10:1). I suggest that we must distinguish between *halo* used in its literal sense, 'nonne?', and the idiomatic, i.e. semantically unanalyzable, *halo* in this verse.

Used literally, *halo* introduces a question, particularly when it is feared that the answer will be negative, e.g.

halo ʔašalta lli bəraxa (Gen 27:36)

'Didn't you set aside a blessing for me?.'

halo θaʔaše (II K 5:13)

'Won't you do it?.'

Used idiomatically (and presumably with a different inflection), *halo* introduces an assertion. This usage is particularly clear (the Jewish custom of answering a question with a question notwithstanding) when the assertion introduced by *halo* happens to be the answer to a question, e.g.

halo ze Dawið ʔeveð Šaʔul melex Yišrael (I Sam 29:3)

'Why that is David, the servant of Saul, King of Israel'

halo zoθ Baθ-ševaʔ baθ ʔeliʔam ʔešeθ ʔUriyya haḥitti

'Why that is Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam, wife of Uriah the Hittite'

The *halo* which introduces assertions is not exactly equivalent to *hinne/hen*, since the former, unlike the latter (but like Swedish *ju*) is used only with propositions whose content the speaker assumes the addressee is already aware of; but, aside from this difference, the two particles are remarkably alike. Both serve as a rule to introduce premises, i.e. assertions which serve as the basis for a logical conclusion, a command, or a question. Accordingly, I suggest that the semantic similarity between *halo* and *hinne* be given at least as much weight as the formal similarity between *halo* and *ha* in determining the reason for the use of *ki* after *halo*.

I turn now to the theoretical aspects of the book. Having uncovered a striking similarity between Hebrew and Arabic (and, with less documentation, Ugaritic, Amarna Canaanite, and Aramaic) in their treatment of sentence adverbials in initial position, B. sets himself the formidable task of trying to explain this treatment. The question he poses is indeed a puzzling one: Why do these languages insert a conjunction and/or presentative between the

sentence adverbial and the rest of the sentence?

B's answer is that the conjunction and/or presentative serves to remove the contrast between grammatical and "psychological" structure which characterizes sentences which have sentence adverbials in initial position. For example

"... in the Hebrew sentence modelled on Gen. xli:17, **ba-ḥālōmī ʾānī ʿōmēd ʿal šəpḥat ha-yʾōr* 'in my dream, I was standing on the bank of the river', *ʿōmēd* is the grammatical predicate, *ʾānī* the grammatical subject, *ba-ḥālōmī* adverbial. Psychologically, however, *ba-ḥālōmī* 'in my dream' is the subject, as it is the term known from the context, Pharaoh's dream being the theme of the whole chapter; accordingly, the rest of the sentence, exhibiting novelty, serves as the psychological predicate. In order to remove the contrast between the psychological and grammatical structure, the psychological subject, the adverbial, is separated by a presentative (or a conjunction) from the rest of the sentence, the psychological predicate. This occurs in Gen. xli:17, *ba-ḥālōmī hīnānī ʿōmēd ʿal šəpḥat ha-yʾōr* 'in my dream, behold, I was standing on the bank of the river', where the adverbial is separated from the rest of the sentence by *hīnānī*." (p. 6)

This answer is not entirely clear. In what sense is the contrast removed? Has the addition of a conjunction somehow changed the grammatical or psychological function of *baḥālōmī*? No such change is apparent. Then does "removal of contrast" have some well-known technical meaning? To answer this question, I went back to Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, a book which B. cites several times in discussing this concept.

Paul illustrates the conflict between grammatical structure and psychological structure using the German equivalent of 'Karl will travel to Berlin tomorrow'. The psychological predicate of this sentence, i.e. the part which the addressee is assumed to be ignorant of, will, of course, vary depending on the situational or linguistic context; the grammatical predicate will not. It is clear, therefore, that in some contexts there will be a contrast between the two, e.g. following questions like:

Where will Karl travel tomorrow?

Who will travel to Berlin tomorrow?

When will Karl travel to Berlin?

Paul goes on to point out (p. 285) that many languages have constructions (today we would speak of "transformations") which serve to eliminate this contrast, e.g. clefting and pseudo-clefting:

It is to Berlin that Karl will travel tomorrow.

The one who will travel to Berlin tomorrow is Karl.

These transformations eliminate the contrast by turning the psychological predicate into the grammatical predicate. Is this what B. means by "removal of contrast"? If so, how does the mere insertion of a conjunction between the psychological subject and its predicate bring this about? B. doesn't tell us.¹

¹In commenting on a pre-print of this review, B. writes that the main function of *wašhinne*, etc. ... is to serve as a marker of a psychological structure which is out of the ordinary." It is not clear to me whether this statement is meant as an interpretation of the statement quoted above (viz. "... to remove the contrast between the

There is another aspect of B's theory which I find difficult to understand. It is the assumption, borrowed from Paul (p. 287), that sentence adverbials usually play the role of psychological subjects. B. writes (p. 11):

"Such a function is natural for conjunctive adverbials, which refer to something already known from the context. This is found, for example, in Biblical Hebrew, Gen. xxxii:21, *gam hinnē 'abhdākhā yā-āqōbh 'ahārēnū* 'moreover [i.e., in addition to what was mentioned before—the psychological subject], behold, your servant Jacob is behind us [the psychological predicate] '...."

No-one will deny that conjunctive adverbials hark back to the preceding sentence in the sense that their truth conditions must be stated partly in terms of the truth conditions of that sentence; but that is not the same as saying that they are known from the context. Paraphrases like 'moreover' = 'in addition to what was mentioned before' don't really help, because only PART of each paraphrase will turn out to be known from the context. Moreover, such paraphrases usually take the form of prepositional phrases, which do not, in general, conform to traditional notions of subjecthood; it makes no sense to ask what knowledge the speaker intended to impart about 'in addition to what was mentioned before'.

This aspect of B's theory is more intelligible when applied to adverbials which are more noun-like, e.g., temporal adverbials, but even there it is difficult to accept. It seems to me that sentence-initial temporal adverbials are used in BH to introduce a NEW temporal frame of reference—not to refer to an old one.

Finally, it should be noted that contrast between grammatical and psychological structure is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for the insertion of a conjunction. That it is not necessary is shown by the presence of *w* in examples like

hinne ha'am hayyose mimmiṣrayim wayxas 'el 'en ha'areṣ (Nu 22:11)
'Lo, the people which has come out of Egypt (and) has covered the earth from view'

wəhaḥayil hayyose 'el hamma'araxa wəhere'u bammiḥama (I Sam 17:20)
'And the army going out to the lines (and) shouted in battle'

'mry mlk yšrl wy'nw 't m'b ymn rbn (Mesha 4-5)
'Omri, king of Israel, (and) oppressed Moab many days'

in which the portion of the sentence preceding *w* is both the grammatical and psychological subject, and the portion following *w* is the grammatical and psychological predicate. That it is not sufficient is shown by the regular absence of *w* in examples like

(*'ašer ydābber hannavi ...*) *bəzaṣon dībberu hannavi* (Deut 18:22)
'(If the prophet speaks ...) the prophet has spoken it maliciously'

(*wəhamminḥay kəminḥay Yehu ben Nīmšī*) *kī bəšigga'on yinḥay* (II K 9:20)
'(And the driving is like the driving of Jehu son of Nimshi) because he drives crazily'

and examples like

psychological and grammatical structure") or as an alternative to it. In any case, it seems that the interpretation which I have given to B.'s statement is not the one which he intended.

(*ma ttəvaqqeš?*) ... *ʔeθ ʔahay ʔanoxi məvaqqeš* (Gen 37:(16-)17)
 '(What are you looking for?) ... I am looking for my brothers'

(*ma kaʔu bəveθexa?*) ... *ʔeθ kol ʔašer bəveθi kaʔu* (II K 20:15)
 '(What did they see in your house?) ... They saw everything in my house'

(*ma ʔatta roʔe, Yirmiyahu?*) ... *maqḡel šaqeš ʔani roʔe* (Jer 1:11)
 '(What do you see, Jeremiah?) ... I see an almond rod'

and examples like

(*Yəhuḏa.*) *ʔatta, yoḏuxa ʔahexa* (Gen 49:8)
 '(Judah!) You, your brothers shall praise you'

(... *Mixayhu.*) *wəhaʔiš mixa, lo beθ ʔelohim* (Ju 17:(4-)5)
 '(... Micah.) And the man Micah, he had a temple'

(*ʔAšonay ...*) *ʔAšonay, baššamayim kisʔo* (Ps 11:4)
 '(the Lord ...) The Lord, His throne is in the heavens'

Though there are differences between these examples (the first set has manner adverbials in initial position serving as psychological predicate; the second set has direct objects in initial position serving as psychological predicate; the third set has (pro)nouns in initial position serving as psychological SUBJECT), they all have a psychological structure (defined in terms of the preceding context, given in parentheses) which differs from their grammatical structure. And yet *w* is not present in these examples or in the other examples of these types which I have seen.

B's treatment of "adverbials which express judgment on the rest of the sentence" as LOGICAL (rather than PSYCHOLOGICAL) predicates (pp. 15-8) is much easier to understand, particularly if read in conjunction with Irena Bellert's excellent article (in *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8 (1977), 337-51) on the semantics of sentence adverbs in English. Nevertheless, in view of the ambiguity of the term "logical predicate", a definition should have been provided, rather than a mere list of references (p. 5, n. 11). B. probably has in mind something similar to the generative semanticists' logical-structure predicate, but I, for one, did not realize this at first. So I checked one of the references on B's list (Jespersen's *Philosophy of Grammar*), only to be confronted by a bewildering array of definitions and a suggestion that the term be scrapped!

While on the subject of terminology, I might note that B's term "adverbials which express judgment on the rest of the sentence" is a bit misleading. The examples adduced by B. (especially p. 17) show that this term covers not only evaluative and modal adverbials, but also frequency adverbials.

One final point. B. believes that the function of the conjunctions (Hebrew *še*, Arabic *ʔan*, *mā*, Aramaic *də*, German *dass*) which follow evaluative, modal, and frequency adverbials is to separate these adverbials from the rest of the sentence (p. 15). The traditional view, if I am not mistaken, is that these conjunctions are complementizers, whose function is to indicate that the following clause (or its truth, or the fact, event, or state of affairs which it denotes) is an argument of the adverbial. I, for one, find the traditional view very attractive, and I would like to know B's reasons for rejecting it.

II. BIBLIOGRAPHY

One of the services AAL ought to offer to readers is publishing bibliographies representing portions of the domain according to any reasonable criterium. This has not been done this far for want of such bibliographies submitted. The following is the first publication of this nature, it is hoped that more will follow. Colleagues are hereby invited to contribute to this section.

The bibliography below lists articles dealing with any aspect of Afroasiatic linguistics that have been published, since 1970, in general linguistic journals or collections. Some of them may have escaped the attention of colleagues not involved in general linguistics. It is quite possible that the list below is not complete. Additions and corrections are solicited, they will be printed in the next issue of the AAL Bibliographic Bulletin. Articles that only casually mention AA data have not been included, only those that devote at least a substantial section to any AA language.

AFROASIATICA IN GENERAL LINGUISTIC PUBLICATIONS
(Since 1970-)

CONTENTS:

Abbreviations

- A. General Afroasiatic
- B. Chadic
- C. Berber
- D. Egyptian
- E. Cushitic
- F. Semitic

- (a) General Semitic
- (b) Ethiopian
- (c) Aramaic
- (d) Hebrew
- (e) Maltese
- (f) Arabic
- (i) Phonology
- (ii) Morphology and syntax
- (iii) Lexicon, sociolinguistics, dialects

ABBREVIATIONS

AL	Anthropological Linguistics
ArL	Archivum Linguisticum
BSL	Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris
BSPL	Bulletin de la Société Polonaise de Linguistique
CJL	The Canadian Journal of Linguistics
CLS	Papers from the <i>n</i> th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society
FL	Foundations of Language
Gl	Glossa
HL	Historiographia Linguistica
JL	Journal of Linguistics

JP	Journal of Phonetics
LA	Linguistic Analysis
La	Lingua
Lg	Language
Lg.Sc.	Language Sciences
LI	Linguistic Inquiry
Lq	Linguistique
Ls	Linguistics
O	Orbis
Ph	Phonetica
PJ	Prace Językoznawcze
RRL	Revue Roumaine de Linguistique
TPL	Transactions of the Philological Society
VY	Voprosi Yazikoznaniya
WPIU	Working Papers on Language Universals
ZP	Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung

A. GENERAL AFROASIATIC

- Bender, M.L. 1971. "The languages of Ethiopia," AL 13:165-288.
 Bender, M.L. 1972. "Addenda to guide to Ethiopian language nomenclature." AL 14:196-203.
 Cooper, R.L. *et al.*, see Ethiopian.
 Hodge, Carleton T. 1972. "Lisramic." Lg.Sc. 20:13-6.
 Hodge, Carleton T. 1977. "Lislakh." In Michel Paradis, ed. *The Fourth LACUS Forum*, 414-20.

B. CHADIC

- Galadanci, M.H.M. 1977. "The structure and syntactic function of compound nouns in Hausa." AL 14:147-54.
 Hodge, Carleton T. 1971. "Is Elohim dead?." AL 13:311-19.
 Hoskinson, James. 1974. "Prosodies and verb stem in Gude." Ls 141:17-26.
 Olofson, Harold. 1974. "Hausa language about gesture." AL 16:25-39.
 Skinner, Neil. 1971. "/ts/ and /k'/ in Hausa." AL 13:301-10.
 Skinner, Neil. 1976. "Sources of Hausa /h/ initial." AL 18:1-7.
 William, Edwin S. 1976. "Underlying tone in Margi and Igbo." LI 7:463-84.
 Zima, Petr. 1974. "Digraphia: The case of Hausa." Ls 124:57-69.
 Zima, Petr. 1975. "Research in the territorial and social stratification of African languages (Hausa and Songhay)." ZP 28:311-23.

C. BERBER

- Guerssel, Mohamed. 1977. "Constraints on phonological rules." LA 3:267-305.
 Galand, Lionel. 1974. "Défini, indéfini, non-défini: les supports de détermination en touareg." BSL 69.1:205-24.

Galand, Lionel. 1977. "Continuité et renouvellement d'un système verbal: le cas du berbère." *BSL* 72.1:275-303.

D. EGYPTIAN

Korostovcev, M.A. 1974. "Osnovnye elementi novoegipetskogo sintaksisa." *VY* (1974).2: 85-95.

E. CUSHITIC

Bender, M.L. and R.L. Cooper. 1971. "Mutual intelligibility within Sidamo." *La* 27:32-52.

Black, Paul. 1972. "Cushitic and Omotic classification." *Lg.Sc.* 23:27-8.

Bliese, Loren F. 1973. "Notes on the reconstruction of glottal stop in the Aussa dialect of 'Afar.'" *AL* 15:373-82.

Bliese, Loren F. 1975. "'Afar vowel dissimilation: A problem in rule ordering.'" *AL* 17:102-106.

Delisle, Gilles L. 1973. "Non-standard concord and the marking hypothesis." *WPLU* 11:85-138.

Hayward, R.J. 1975. "Middle voice verb forms in Eastern Cushitic." *TPL* (1975):203-24.

Hetzron, R. 1972. "Phonology in syntax." *JL* 8:251-65 [259-61 on Somali plural agreement]

Hudson, R.A. 1973. "Syllables, moras and accents in Beja." *JL* 9:53-63.

Hudson, R.A. 1973. "An 'Item-and-paradigm' approach to Beja syntax and morphology." *FL* 9:504-48.

Little, G.D. See Ethiopian.

Mewis, Catherine. 1975. "Bemerkungen zur Sprachpolitik der Republik Somalia." *ZP* 28:324-30.

Sasse, H.J. See Semitic.

Zaborski, Andrzej. 1970. "Cushitic languages—an unexplored subcontinent." *Bulletin of the International Committee on Urgent Anthropological and Ethnological Research* 12:119-28.

Zaborski, Andrzej. N.d. "Remarks on the apophony in Cushitic." *BSPL* 33:165-69.

F. SEMITIC

(a) General Semitic

Fellman, Jack. 1973. "Language and national identity. The case of the Middle East." *AL* 15:244-49.

Fellman, Jack. 1973. "Judah ibn Quraysh." *Lg.Sc.* 24:15-16.

Fellman, Jack. 1975. "A sociolinguistic comparison of two modern Semitic languages: Hebrew and Amharic." *AL* 17:15-18.

Hetzron, Robert. 1976. "Two principles of genetic reconstruction." *La* 38:89-108.

Iványi, T. See Arabic, Phonology.

Lek'iašvili, A. 1971. "Über die Kasusflexion in den semitischen Sprachen." *ZP* 24:76-90.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1977. "A note on *wh*-movement." *La* 41:343-54.

Zaborski, A. 1971. "Biconsonantal verbal roots in Semitic." *PJ* 35:51-98.

(b) Ethiopian

- Bender, M.L. 1972. "Loanwords in Amharic daily newspapers." 14:317-22.
- Cooper, Robert L., and Ronald J. Horvath. 1973. "Language, migration and urbanism in Ethiopia." 15:221-43.
- Fellman, Jack. 1976. "Amhara verbal behaviour." 18:8-10.
- Hoben, Susan J. 1976. "Amhara verbal behavior: A commentary." *AL* 18:380-86.
- Hudson, Grover. 1974. "The representation of non-productive alternation." In John Anderson and Charles Jones (eds.), *Historical Linguistics. II Theory and Description in Phonology*, 203-29. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Leslau, Wolf. 1970. "Nasalization in the East Gurage group of Semitic Ethiopic." *Ph* 22:160-69.
- Little, Greta D. 1974. "Syntactic evidence of language contact: Cushitic influence in Amharic." In Roger W. Shuy and Charles-James N. Bailey (eds.), *Towards Tomorrow's Linguistics*, 267-75. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP.
- Little, Greta D. 1975. "Does word order in noun compounding reflect sentential syntax." In Peter A. Reich (ed.), *The Second LACUS Forum*, 249-54.
- Tubiana, Joseph. 1974. "Passé et futur des emprunts lexicaux: l'exemple de l'amharique." *BSL* 69.1:191-204.

(c) Aramaic

- Bogolyubov, M.N. 1974. "Arameyskaya versiya lidiysko-arameyskoy bilingvī." *VV* (1974), 6:106-12.
- Malone, Joseph L. 1970. "In defense of non-uniqueness of phonological representation." *Lg* 46:328-35.
- Malone, Joseph L. 1971. "Systematic metathesis in Mandaic." *Lg* 47:394-415.
- Malone, Joseph L. 1972. "The Mandaic syllable-adjustment circuit and its historical origin." *CLS* 8:473-81.
- Malone, Joseph L. 1973. "A case of optional-obligatory rule ordering." *FL* 10:579-80.
- Ringen, Catherine O. 1974. "Obligatory-optional precedence." *FL* 11:565-70.
- Solomon, Zomaya S. and Robert K. Headley. 1973. "The phonology of modern spoken Syriac." *AL* 15:136-47.

(d) Hebrew (See *AAL* 2/10 for *Linguistics* 120)

- Barkaī, Malachi. 1974. "On duration and spirantization in Biblical Hebrew." *LI* 5:456-9.
- Barkaī, Malachi. 1978. "Phonological opacity vs. semantic transparency: two cases from Israeli Hebrew." *La* 44:363-78.
- Bar-Lev, Z. 1978. "The Hebrew morpheme." *La* 45:319-31.
- Berman, Ruth Aronson. 1977. "Natural phonological processes at the one-word stage." *La* 43:1-21.
- Cole, Peter. 1974. "Hebrew tense and the performative analysis." *CLS* 10:73-89.

- Cole, Peter. 1976. "Relativization in Hebrew." *LI* 7:686-93.
- Cole, Peter. 1976. "The interface of theory and description: Notes on modern Hebrew relativization." *Lg* 52:563-83.
- Cole, Peter and S.N. Sridhar. 1977. "Clause union and relational grammar: Evidence from Hebrew and Kannada." *LI* 8:700-19.
- Dotan, Aron. 1977. "Wilhelm Bacher's place in the history of Hebrew linguistics." *HL* 4:135-57.
- Fellman, Jack. 1973. "Concerning the 'revival' of the Hebrew language." *AL* 15:250-57.
- Fellman, Jack. 1971. "The Hebrew revival: a myth?" *O* 23:350-54.
- Fellman, Jack. 1975. "The Hebrew language on the eve of its revival." *O* 24:350-53.
- Fellman, Jack. 1976. See Arabic (iii)
- Givón, Talmy. 1977. "The drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The pragmatics of tense-aspect." In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, 181-254. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Grosu, Alexander. 1975. "A note on analogy." *LI* 6:468-75.
- Laufer, A. 1975. "A programme for synthesizing Hebrew speech." *Ph* 52:292-99.
- Levin, Saul. 1974. "Greek occupational terms with Semitic counterparts." In A. and V.B. Makkai (eds.), *The First LACUS Forum*, 246-63. Columbia: Hornbeam Press.
- Malone, Joseph L. 1972. "A Hebrew flip-flop rule and its historical origins." *La* 30: 422-48.
- Malone, Joseph L. 1976. "Phonological evidence for syntactic breaking: A surprise from Tiberian Hebrew." *CLS* 12:486-94.
- Newman, Aryeh. 1975. "A semantic analysis of English and Hebrew cooking terms." *La* 37: 53-79.
- Sadock, Jerrold. 1970. "The treatment of exceptions to the Modern Hebrew stress rule." *CLS* 6:543-47.
- Sampson, Geoffrey. 1973. "Duration in Hebrew consonants." *LI* 4:101-104.
- Shafter, Douglas. 1972. "The Hebrew revival myth." *O* 21:315-26.
- Wexler, Paul. 1974. See Arabic (iii)
- Ziv, Yael and Peter Cole. 1974. "Relative extraposition and the scope of definite descriptions." *CLS* 10:772-86.

(e) Maltese

- Brame, Michael K. 1974. See Arabic (i)
- Cowan, William. 1970. "A persistent rule in Maltese." *CJL* 15:122-28.
- Cowan, William. 1971. "An underground rule in Maltese." *JL* 7:245-51.
- Erikson, Jon L. 1973. "Some observations on Cowan's Maltese 'underground' rule." *JL* 9: 307-11.
- Krier, Fernande. 1975. "Analyse syntaxique de la phrase nominale en maltais." *La* 11: 93-116.
- Krier, Fernande. 1975. "Analyse phonologique du maltais." *Ph* 32:103-29.

Puech, Gilbert. 1978. "A cross-dialectal study of vowel harmony in Maltese." *CLS* 14:377-90.

(f) Arabic

(i) Phonology

Abdul-Ghani, Abdul-Ghani. 1976. "Direction and motivation of phonological rules in Palestinian Arabic." *CLS* 12:13-23.

Ali, Latif H. and Raymond G. Daniloff. 1974. "The perception of coarticulated emphaticness." *Ph* 29:225-31.

Bohas, Georges. 1974. "La métrique arabe classique." *Ls* 140:59-68.

Brame, Michael K. 1974. "The cycle in phonology: Stress in Palestinian, Maltese and Spanish." *LI* 5:39-60.

Delattre, Pierre. 1971. "Pharyngeal features in consonants of Arabic, German, Spanish, French, and American English." *Ph* 23:129-55.

Grand Henry, Jacques. 1971. "Observations sur la phonétique des parlers arabes de Ténès (Algérie Occidentale)." *O* 20:99-101.

Ibrahim, M.H. 1972. "Phonemicists and the vowels of spoken Arabic." *Lg.Sc.* 23:25-26.

Iványi, Tamás. 1978. "Hangrendszer és hangváltozás az arabban és a sémi nyelvekben." *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok* 12:145-71.

Kahn, M. 1975. See (iii)

Kaye, Alan S. 1972. "Arabic /žiim/." *Ls* 79:31-72.

Larudee, F. 1973. "Word stress in the spoken Arabic of Cairo." *Lg.Sc.* 26:31-4.

Odisho, Edward Y. 1977. "Arabic /q/: a voiceless unaspirated uvular plosive." *La* 42:343-47.

Yeni-Konshian, G.H., S. Caramazza and M.S. Preston. 1977. "A study of voicing in Lebanese Arabic." *JP* 5:35-48.

(ii) Morphology and syntax

Ali, Latif H. 1970. "Some aspects of negation in English and Baghdadi Arabic." *AAL* 1:67-83.

Anghelescu, Nadia. 1974. "Sur le système de l'article en arabe." *RRL* 19:45-52.

Beeston, A.F.L. 1974. "Embedding of the theme-predicate structure in Arabic." *Lg* 50:474-77.

Blanc, Haim. 1970. "Dual and pseudo-dual in the Arabic dialects." *Lg* 46:42-57.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. "The syntax of action nominals: A cross-language study." *La* 40:177-201 [194-96: Classical Arabic]

Delisle, G. L. 1973. See Cushitic

Diem, Werner. 1970. "Die unregelmäßige Formen der 3. Person feminin Singular Perfekt in der Dialekten des Seszhaften des syrisch-libanesisch-palästinensischen Sprachgebietes." *O* 19:346-59.

Diem, Werner. 1972. "Nocheinmal zum Problem der unregelmäßigen Formen der 3. fem. Sing. Perf. in arabischen Dialekten: Der Befund der jemenitische Dialekte." *O* 21:312-14.

Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 1976. "Relatives et adjectives en arabe: Le problème de la détermination." *La* 38:125-52.

- Goldenberg, Yves. 1974. "A distributional analysis of negative morphemes in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic." *RRL* 19:385-97.
- Hetzron, Robert. 1975. "Where the grammar fails." *Lg* 51:859-72 [861-63 on Arabic 1-2-2 verbs].
- Levy, M. and J.L. Fidelholtz. 1971. "Arabic broken plurals, rule features and lexical features." *Gl* 5:57-70.
- Lewkowicz, Nancy Kennedy. 1971. "Topic-comment and relative clause in Arabic." *Lg* 46:42-57.
- Schreiber, Peter A. and Frank Anshen. 1974. "Arabic topicalization: alternative approaches." *Lg.Sc.* 29:19-21.
- Wise, Hilary. 1972. "Concord in spoken Egyptian Arabic." *Atl* 3:7-17.
- (iii) Lexicon, Sociolinguistics, Dialects
- Cadora, Frederic J. 1976. "Lexical relationship among Arabic dialects and the Swadesh list." *AL* 18:237-60.
- Cadora, Frederic J. 1976. "Contrastive compatibility in some Arabic dialects and their classification." *AL* 18:393-407.
- Cohen, David. 1973. "Variantes, variétés dialectales et contacts linguistiques en domaine arabe." *BSL* 68.I:215-48.
- Diem, Werner. 1974. "A historical interpretation of Iraqi Arabic 'aku 'there is'." *O* 23:448-53.
- El-Dash, Linda and G. Richard Tucker. 1975. "Subjective reactions to various speech styles in Egypt." *Ls* 166:33-54.
- Fellman, Jack. 1973. "Sociolinguistic problems in the Middle Eastern Arab world: an overview." *AL* 15:24-32.
- Fellman, Jack. 1976. "Language attitudes and linguistic history: A note on the Hebrew and Arabic cases." *O* 25:277-79.
- Garmadi, Le Cloirec. 1976. "La dénomination des couleurs en arabe tunisien et en français." *Lq* 12:55-86.
- Kahn, M. 1975. "Arabic emphatics: The evidence for cultural determinants of phonetic sex-typing." *Ph* 31:38-50.
- Kaye, Alan S. 1970. "Modern Standard Arabic and the colloquials." *La* 24:374-91.
- Kaye, Alan S. 1972. "Remarks on diglossia in Arabic." *Ls* 81:32-48.
- McLoughlin, L.J. 1972. "Towards a definition of Modern Standard Arabic." *Atl* 3:57-73.
- Morsi, M.A. and A. Kos. 1975. "Die Witterungsverben: Konfrontation Deutsch/Arabisch." *ZP* 26:35-46.
- Peterson, David. 1972. "Some explanatory methods of the Arab grammarians." *CLS* 8:504-15.
- Wexler, Paul. 1974. "The cartography of unspoken languages of culture and literature (Reflections on the diffusion of Arabic and Hebrew)." *O* 23:30-51.
- Yassin, M. Aziz F. 1977. "Kinship terms in Kuwaiti Arabic." *AL* 19:126-32.
- Yassin, M. Aziz F. 1978. "Personal names of addresses in Kuwaiti Arabic." *AL* 20:53-63.

AFROASIATIC DIALECTS

Editor: Thomas G. Penchoen (University of California, Los Angeles): Berber

Advisory Board: Giorgio Buccellati (University of California, Los Angeles): Akkadian
Russell G. Schuh (University of California, Los Angeles): Chadic
Stanislav Segert (University of California, Los Angeles): Northwest-Semitic

Afroasiatic Dialects (*AAD*) seeks to provide concise descriptions of individual languages which belong to the Afroasiatic language family. It is primarily directed toward an audience consisting, on the one hand, of students of one or several Afroasiatic languages, and, on the other, of students of linguistics. In these volumes, both these groups should find succinct treatises such as to provide familiarity with the basic structure of the language in question in a comparative perspective. Each description will be comprehensive in scope and sufficiently detailed in exemplification. But at the same time the aim will be to cut through to the essential and to avoid specialized argumentation. The goal then is neither to publish a corpus of exhaustive reference grammars nor to provide a platform for the analytical defense of theoretical questions. In this sense the series is properly data-oriented. Though the authors will necessarily be of a variety of theoretical persuasions and each will have his own set of preferences for presentation, not the least important goal will be to achieve as high a degree as possible of uniformity in structure, and in the conventional signs and terminology used. This being accomplished, the reader should have no difficulty in finding points of resemblance and divergence amongst the languages which concern him with regard to some point of inquiry. The term 'dialects' in the series' title refers not only to modern spoken vernaculars but to historically definable stages of any language of the various branches. Publication of studies of as many such dialects as possible would provide, we feel, both an encouragement to comparative work and a sound documentary base on which alone this work may fruitfully progress.

AAD 1 - Berber: *TAMAZIGHT OF THE AYT NDHIR* by Thomas G. Penchoen. 1973, IV-124 pp., \$8.50.

The Ayt Ndhir dialect which is described belongs to one of the major Berber languages, Tamazight, spoken in the Middle Atlas Mountains of central Morocco. The description is based in the main on research undertaken with native speakers of the Ayt Ndhir territory surrounding El Hajeb. — While directed to the non-specialist, a number of points in the description proper will be of interest to the specialist as well: the presentation of noun and verb morphology points up a number of regularities which more often than not have been obscured in previous descriptions. Also, phonological rules are given which account for the major share of morphophonemic complexities. The reader will find in the appendices and 'optional' sections conjugation tables of typical verbs—including detailed observations on the placement of shwa in verbs—, a chart showing the main morphological patterns involved in verb derivation, a description of the phonological rules applying in complex sequences of morphemes of the verb group, the 'basic' vocabulary contained in several well-known lexicostatistic word lists, and a chart of the Tifinay alphabet used by the Tuareg.

AAD 2 - Ancient Egyptian: *MIDDLE EGYPTIAN* by John Callender. 1975, 150 pp., \$10.

This grammar deals with the literary language used in Egypt from ca. 2000 to 1200 B.C. and considered in even later times to be the classical written form of Egyptian. The book is directed toward the general linguist as well as the Egyptologist; examples are glossed and written in transcription and there is an index of grammatical terms and Egyptian morphemes. A comprehensive set of paradigms of both verbal and non-verbal predicate types is included as an appendix, together with an appendix on negation and one on the historical origin of certain constructions. — The grammar contains three main parts: phonology, morphology, and syntax, of which the last receives most emphasis. The section on phonology sketches the laws of sound change to the extent they can be discovered. The section on morphology stresses the paradigmatic character of verb tenses and their derivations. A distinction is made between truly paradigmatic tenses and tenses borrowed from Old Egyptian for quotations or special effect. Following Polotsky, the "emphatic forms" are treated as nominalizations under the rubric "manner nominalizations." Unlike previous grammars of Egyptian, this grammar discusses syntax according to transformational categories. The process of "clefting" interrelates emphatic forms, the "participial statement" and constructions with *pw*+ relatives. The process character of negation is emphasized, and the implications of so considering it are developed in a special appendix. A sample text is also included, accompanied by a vocabulary and a translation.

AAD 3 - Semitic: *DAMASCUS ARABIC* by Arne Ambros. 1977, vii-123 pp., \$13.

Based on both previous works and the author's own observations, the grammar describes the Sedentary Eastern Arabic dialect spoken in Damascus. While strictly synchronic and written without presupposing knowledge of classical Arabic, it follows traditional arrangement and terminology as closely as possible without failing however to do justice to the individual traits of the dialect. Appendices deal with 1) the regular reflexes of Classical Arabic phonemes in Damascus Arabic, and rules governing the reduction of vowels, and 2) a discussion of morphological substitutions which cannot be interpreted as describing the historical development from Classical Arabic to Damascus Arabic.

All prices are postpaid. Payment must accompany orders from individuals.
A handling fee of \$1.00 will be charged to libraries if order is not prepaid. Order from:
UNDENA PUBLICATIONS, P.O. Box 97, Malibu, California 90265, U.S.A.

AFROASIATIC LINGUISTICS

AAL includes contributions in linguistics within the vast domain of Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) languages. Articles of general, theoretical interest using Afroasiatic material, descriptive, historical and comparative studies are included.

Editors: Robert Hetzron (698 Zink Av., Santa Barbara, Ca. 93111, U.S.A.)
Russell G. Schuh (15337 Hart St., Van Nuys, Ca. 91406, U.S.A.)

Volume One

Articles by P. Newman, R. G. Schuh, J. L. Malone, R. Hetzron, T. Givón, T. M. Johnstone, B. W. Andrzejewski, and H. Minkoff.

Volume Two

Articles by D. R. Cohen, C. D. Johnson, A. Barnea, R. Nir, C. T. Hodge, G. Janssens, S. Segert, J. B. Callender, J. L. Malone, T. Givón, and A. D. Corré.

Volume Three

Articles by R. G. Schuh, G. Buccellati, R. Hetzron, J. Saib, R. Steiner, D. Boyarin, I. Avinery, A. Zaborski, E. Rubinstein, and P. Abboud.

Volume Four

1. Neil Skinner, *North Bauchi Chadic Languages: Common Roots*, 49 pp.
Id., *'Fly' (Noun) and 'Mouth' in Afroasiatic*, 12 pp., \$5.15.
2. Lewis Glinert, *Number Switch: A Singular Feature-change Rule in Modern Hebrew*, 38 pp., \$3.20.
3. Russell G. Schuh, *Bade/Ngizim Determiner System*, 74 pp., \$6.25.
4. Joshua Blau, *The Beginnings of the Arabic Diglossia. A Study of the Origins of Neoarabic*, 28 pp., \$2.35.

Volume Five

1. Paul Newman, *Chadic Classification and Reconstructions*, 42 pp., \$3.55.
2. D. L. Appleyard, *A Comparative Approach to the Amharic Lexicon*, 67 pp., \$5.65.
3. Shmuel Bolozy, *Word Formation Strategies in the Hebrew Verb System: Denominative Verbs*, 26 pp., \$2.20.
4. J. Rosenhouse, *On the Complexity of Some Types of Complex Sentences in Urban Moroccan Arabic and Some Other Arabic Dialects*, 15 pp., \$1.30.
5. Janet H. Johnson, *Remarks on Egyptian Verbal Sentences*, 20 pp., \$1.70.
6. Donald A. Burquest, *Semantic Parameters in Angas Kinship Terminology*, 29 pp., \$2.45.

Volume Six

1. Malachi Barkai, *Theoretical Implications of Consonant Sequence Constraints in Israeli Hebrew*, 13 pp.
Zev Bar-Lev, *The Ordering of Hebrew Morphological Processes*, 8 pp., \$1.85.
2. Bernd Heine, *The Sam Languages: A History of Rendille, Boni and Somali*, 93 pp., \$7.80.
3. Ruth Aronson Berman, *Lexical Decomposition and Lexical Unity in the Expression of Derived Verbal Categories in Modern Hebrew*, 26 pp., \$2.60.
4. *Bibliographic Bulletin*, 18 pp., \$1.80.

Subscriptions to one volume of about 200 pp.: \$17.00. Individual issues available separately. Descriptive flyers, with complete list of abstracts and prices for individual issues, are free on request. Write to:

UNDENA PUBLICATIONS, P.O. Box 97, Malibu, California 90265, U.S.A.

AAL STYLE SHEET UNDENA PUBLICATIONS

The primary goal of Undena Publications is to publish at lowest cost possible while keeping the highest possible standards. In order to do this we need your cooperation when submitting manuscripts. Please read the information below.

General Procedures

MANUSCRIPT: Keep a duplicate copy of your submitted manuscript since this will not be included when proofs are sent to you.

PROOFS: Each author will receive proofs for corrections.

CORRECTIONS AND CHANGES: Corrections and changes must be kept to an absolute minimum. Major changes, i.e., changes that affect more than a couple of lines, or a great many minor changes, will be at the author's expense. You will be presented with a bill based on the amount of work involved. All changes as submitted by the author on the proofs are suggestions only and may be disregarded at the discretion of the editor. Changes that affect entire pages will not be accepted.

OFFPRINTS AND COPIES: Authors will receive 10 free copies of the work. Additional copies will be available at discounts of 30% for a single order of 5 copies or more, and 40% for a single order of 20 copies or more (a single order is to be billed and shipped to the same address).

Manuscript Preparation

MANUSCRIPT: All material must be typed, double-spaced throughout on *non-erasable* and *non-onionskin* bond; photocopies or xeroxcopies are accepted. Isolated corrections may be entered by hand, but should be printed.

PUNCTUATION, ETC.: Material in foreign languages should have single underline; emphasized material should be doubly underlined. Use single quotes for glosses, double quotes for everything else.

FOOTNOTES: All notes are to be typed, double-spaced, on separate pages with running numeration. Footnotes should be restricted to substantive comments, not used for references (see below).

ABSTRACT: All manuscripts should be accompanied by an abstract of approximately 100-125 words.

TITLES: Authors are strongly encouraged to divide their manuscripts into sections, subsections, etc. numbered and titled. There should be a table of contents (following the abstract) referring to these sections on the following model:

1. (Major heading)
 - 1.1 (Sub-heading)
 - 1.2 (Sub-heading)
 - 1.2.1 (Second level sub-heading)
 - 1.2.2 (Second level sub-heading)
2. (Major heading)

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY: References in the text should *not* be made in footnotes but rather by the last name of the author followed by date of publication of the reference, e.g. Diakonoff (1965).

In the bibliography for journal articles, list

Author's surname, first name. Date. "Title." *Journal* Volume: Pages.

For books, list

Author's surname, first name. Date. *Title*. Place of publication: Publisher.

If more than one publication bearing the same date is mentioned, use small letters, e.g. 1965a for the first publication by a single author with that date, 1965b for the second, etc. In referencing articles in edited volumes, give name(s) of editor(s).

new from Undena



Syria in the Amarna Age

By **M. Liverani** *MANE* 1/5, 30 pp., \$3.25.

Translation of three Italian articles: *Pharaoh's Letters to Rib-Adda* (1971); *Social Implications in the Politics of Abdi-Aširta of Amurru* (1965); "Irrational" Elements in the *Amarna Trade* (1971).

Ebla: Recent Discoveries at Tell Mardikh

By **P. Matthiae** *MANE* 1/6, 16 pp., 26 plates, \$6.50.

Ebla in the Period of the Amorite Dynasties and the Dynasty of Akkad. Recent Archaeological Discoveries at Tell Mardikh. Translation of a major article in *Orientalia* 1975 with many new illustrations.

Old Canaanite Texts from Ebla

By **G. Pettinato** *MANE* 2/1, 10 pp., \$1.50.

Translation of the first article on the language of Ebla: *Cuneiform Texts of the Third Millennium in Old-Canaanite Recovered during the 1974 Season at Tell Mardikh-Ebla* (*Orientalia* 1975).

The Babyloniaca of Berossus

By **S. M. Burstein** *SANE* 1/5, 39 pp., \$4.20.

This fascicle contains the first complete English translation of the surviving fragments of this important work.

Gli eponimi medio-assiri

By **C. Saporetti** *BM* 9, 165 pp., (in Italian) \$20.50 (soft), \$24.50 (hard).

A documentary catalogue of Middle Assyrian eponyms with ample philological and historical notes.

Early Technologies

Edited by **D. Schmandt-Besserat** *Texas Middle Eastern Studies* 3, pp. iv-77, 28 plates, \$16.00 (hard), \$11.50 (soft).

A new assessment of the major first steps in the technological advancements of humankind. Articles by J. A. Williams, Th. A. Wertime, D. Schmandt-Besserat, D. de Solla Price, B. S. Hall, J. F. Epstein.

Babylonian Planetary Omens

By **E. Reiner** and **D. Pingree** *BM* 2/2: Enūma Anu Enlil, Tablet 50 and 51. In press.

This is the second volume in a continuing series which will publish in oversize some twenty-odd unpublished tablets of the Enūma Anu Enlil, the coronal corpus of celestial omens known to the Babylonians.

California residents please add 6% sales tax. For additional information, descriptive flyers of individual titles, and a general catalogue, write:

UNDENA PUBLICATIONS, P.O. Box 97, Dept. C.B., Malibu, Ca. 90265.